

Comparison of MCMI Personality Profiles of Frotteurs, Rapists and Non - Sex
Related Criminals in Hong Kong

A Thesis

Submitted to

The Graduate School

The Chinese University of Hong Kong

In Partial Fulfilment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Philosophy

in Clinical Psychology

by

Sarina S. F. Lam

Division of Psychology

June 1997



Abstract

The present study compared the personality profiles of frotteurs, rapists and non - sex related criminals in Hong Kong. Eleven frotteurs, 19 rapists and 20 non - sex related criminals completed the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory, the UCLA Loneliness scale and individually interviewed. Results suggested that the two sex offender groups were comparatively more defensive than the non - sex related criminals. The frotteurs and rapist scored lower on antisocial tendency, aggression and drug dependency than the non - sex related criminals. For frotteurs, considerable portion of their profiles peaked at Avoidant, Depressive, Dependent and Schizoid scales. While rapists primed at various scales including Avoidant, Depressive, Negativistic and Self - Defeating scales, the incarcerated control scored highest mainly on Antisocial and Aggressive scales. Though sex offenders were not found to be more lonely than incarcerated control, they had fewer courtship and considerable portion of them admitted to have difficulties in relating to female peers. Results were discussed with reference to the interplay of personality and loneliness with other factors that led to sexual offending

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisors, Dr. Wai Chan and Dr. Freedom Leung (in alphabetical order), for their invaluable advice and persistent support. Thanks also go to Senior Clinical Psychologist of Correctional Services Department, Mr. Lu Chan Ching Chuen, and her colleagues in providing guidance and logistic support for data collection. Finally, I would like to thank all the research participants for their patience and cooperation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLES OF CONTENTS	iv
CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION	1
The nature of frotteurism	1
Personality of sex offenders	2
Other related constructs of personality	9
Purpose of the present research	11
CHAPTER II - METHODS	12
Subjects	12
Measures	14
Procedure	18
CHAPTER III - RESULTS	18
Background information of the subjects	18
Scores for MCMI scales	22
Analysis of MCMI code types	28
Loneliness and heterosexual variables gathered from interviews	30
CHAPTER IV - DISCUSSION	33
Background of frotteurs in the present sample	33
Personality problems and clinical syndromes of frotteurs as compared to rapists and controls	35
Group profiles interpretation	36
Loneliness and heterosexual relationship	40
The inter - relationship of personality, loneliness and sexual offending	40
Limitation of present research and future direction	42
REFERENCES	43
APPENDICES	49

Comparison of MCMI Personality Profiles of Frotteurs, Rapists and Non - Sex Related Criminals in Hong Kong

The Nature of Frotteurism

According to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM - IV), frotteurism refers to recurrent, intense sexually arousing fantasies, sexual urges or behaviours involving touching and rubbing against a non - consenting person. It usually occurs in crowded places (e.g. crowded railway compartment) where detection is often difficult.

In the present study, frotteurs refer to those convicted for their indecent assault on an adult woman in public area. . Although people with such a conviction are not necessarily paraphilic, these two groups are likely to overlap considerably. Formal fulfillment of the DSM - IV diagnostic criteria of frotteurism might not be attained by the present sample as deviant sexual arousal pattern are difficult to detect through only paper - and - pencil tests.

Frotteurism is often co - occurs with exhibitionism and voyeurism. For instance, Freund (1990) reported that among 119 identified frotteurs, 61.3% and 30.2% of them also committed exhibitionism and voyeurism respectively. He thus interpreted such a high co - occurrence a support for the courtship disorder hypothesis: that voyeurism, exhibitionism, frotteurism and preferential rape (preference for nonconsenting over consenting sex) are expressions of a common “ underlying ” disorder. Fisher and Howells (1993) also commented that voyeurism, exhibitionism and frotteurism provided sexual gratification with minimum needs of social interaction. Though it is still unclear about the causes that underlying these sexual

anomalies, their high co - morbidity and nonconsenting sexual nature all suggested their close relationship. In view of the above, and because frotteurism is a very new research area with few published studies, the following review would include literature on exhibitionism and voyeurism, in the hope of shedding light on understanding more about frotteurism.

Personality of Sex Offenders

Rader (1977) compared the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) profiles of exhibitionists ($n = 36$), rapists ($n = 47$), and nonsexual assaulters ($n = 46$). While the group profile of the exhibitionists fell entirely within the normal limits, those of the rapists and the assaulters were more deviant than the general population. The rapists, who committed crimes of both violent and sexual nature, were found to be the most disturbed among the three. Basing on the rapist's group profiles, they appeared to be odd, irritable, hostile, angry, suspicious, perhaps also somewhat depressed and anxious. Acting out, projecting blames, repression and denial were their major defense mechanism. They were considered as being fearful of social involvement and having low social intelligence with limited ability to communicate and empathize. The exhibitionists, on the other hand, were not significantly different from the assaulter group. They were depicted as normal individuals with mildly non - conforming tendencies.

Langevin, Paitich, Freeman, Mann, and Handy (1978) compared the personality characteristics of exhibitionists with other sexually anomalous males (including pedophiles, transsexual, rape, voyeurism and etc.) as well as a control group using the MMPI and Cattell's 16 PF. It was postulated that shyness, passivity,

social introversion, femininity and a lack of assertiveness were associated with exhibitionism. It was further hypothesized that exhibitionists shared the above characteristics with pedophiles. Results indicated that exhibitionists as a group displayed an unremarkable profile with little evidence of significant pathology. They displayed some anti - social tendencies, but were neither found to be particularly shy nor feline.

Blair and Richard (1981) reviewed literature on exhibitionists published between the 60's and the early 70's. The majority of these studies were based on interviews and court reports instead of psychometric tests. They identified a number of characteristics of exhibitionists that were being consistently reported. These included a sense of inferiority, shyness, unassertiveness, lacking social skills and having difficulties in handling hostility and aggression. Overt psychological disturbances, however, were rare. Although a high proportion were or had married, marital adjustment was poorer than average, and there tended to be deficits in heterosexual skills and a lower than average frequency of heterosexual activity. Finally, many exhibitionists had a past criminal history, both sex or non - sex related.

Forgac and Michaels (1982) proposed a typology of exhibitionists based on their non - exhibitionistic criminal history. It was hypothesized that exhibitionists without other criminal involvement (pure type) would have different personality characteristics than those with non - exhibitionistic criminal involvement (criminal type). Specifically, the criminal type displayed greater pathology and sociopathy. Moreover, the criminal type would be more deviant and less socialized whereas the pure type would be over - socialized, inhibited, passive and conforming. Thirty pure

and 54 criminal exhibitionists were compared using the MMPI and the California Personality Inventory (CPI). As predicted, the criminal group showed greater pathology than the pure group. The criminal group had greater elevations on MMPI Psychopathic Deviate and Schizophrenia scales than the pure group. The former also had lower scores on CPI Responsibility and Socialization scales than the pure group. On the Goldberg indices that used to differentiate normal versus deviant and psychiatric versus sociopathic MMPI group profiles, while the pure group lay entirely within normal range, the criminal group fell within the deviant range with sociopathic tendencies. Although there were support for the under - socialization of the criminal type, evidence that pure type was over - socialized were lacking. Forgac, Cassel and Michaels (1984) reanalyzed the data of Forgac and Michaels (1982). They found that the degree of pathology was associated with past non sexual crimes rather than exhibitionistic chronicity.

Literature reviewed above involved mainly interpretation of mean scale or profile scores and comparison of those scores with the averages of other offender groups. Erickson, Luxenberg, Walbek and Seely (1987), however, considered such practices perpetuated simplistic and stereotypic descriptions of the psychological characteristics of sex offenders. They thus examined the variety of code types among 403 sex offenders using MMPI. Nineteen percent of these profiles were entirely within the normal range, with none of the scale exceed the clinical cut - off. When compared the profiles of this sex offender sample with the general prison sample, there were significantly more 4-8/8-4 profiles (elevated in Psychopathic Deviation and Schizophrenia scale) among the former group but 4-9/9-4 profiles (elevated in

Psychopathic Deviation and Hypomania scale) were equally prevalent in both samples.

Some of the common beliefs about the psychodynamics of the rapists, child molesters and homosexual offenders were reflected by the most frequent code types of these sub - groups. For instance, the most popular code types for offenders against women were 4-8/8-4 and 4-9/9-4. The former was generally odd, impulsive and oppositional to authority while the latter was anti - social and restless, representing the typical profiles of the prison population. The most common code types for child molesters, on the other hand, was 4-2/2-4. People with such a profiles were described as passive -dependent, socially anxious, impulsive and alcoholic. Finally, homosexual offenders frequently showed elevated masculinity which might reflected their problems in sexual identity or sexual role.

These frequent code types, however, occurred no more than 21% in any of these sub - groups and were often found among other offense groups as well. Except for anti - social personality, therefore, no psychological characteristics was truly typical. These typical characteristics were more common in recidivists than in the first offenders who showed significantly greater variety of code types and the least degree of disturbance. Nevertheless, the previous offenses of the recidivists were not specified. Thus, although some associations appeared to exist between personality characteristics and the types of sexual offenses, it was only applicable to part of the offenders. The heterogeneous nature of sex offender groups precluded any generalizations.

Studies on indecent assault offenders among indecent assault was extremely scarce. The only literature that provided such an invaluable discussion was published by Lu (1987). It was a preliminary attempt to compare the demographic, family and other psychosocial backgrounds of people convicted of either indecent assault ($n = 24$) or rape ($n = 17$) as assessed by the Sexual Offender Assessment Checklist developed by the Correctional Services Department of Hong Kong. Both groups shared much similarity in their profiles, with about one third of these groups reported to have behavioral problems (e.g. truancy and poor discipline) and social withdrawal during adolescence. Besides, incidence rate of sexual deviance among the two groups of offenders were low, with only one in each group. The only significant difference observed was that the rapist had more affiliation with the triad than the indecent assault groups. There were also suggestive data showing that, as adults, the rape group was more socially competent, sexually adequate, and heterosexually adjusted than the indecent assault group. Such results implied that while sex offending for the rape group represented a generalized pattern of acting out, sexual offending of the indecent assault group appeared to stem from social inadequacy and heterosexual maladjustment.

Langevin et al. (1988) were among the first few researchers who attempted to explore the prevalence of DSM - III R diagnosis among 322 sexual offenders. The diagnosis of sexual deviation and personality disorders occurs more often than other diagnosis. In their rapist sample, for instance, 78% and 13% of subjects were diagnosed by psychiatrists as having personality disorders and sexual deviation respectively. This suggested that rapists might be sexually conventional but who have

behavioural problems. In contrast, 19 % of the voyeurs received a personality disorder diagnosis but 45% of them were considered as sexual deviance. This suggested that for voyeurs, the presence of a sexual anomaly was more prominent than a personality problem.

In their attempt to objectively detect possible personality traits that could differentiate various groups of sexual offenders, mainly comprising of pedophiles, sexually aggressive and miscellaneous sex offenders, Langevin et al. (1988) administered Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory (MCMI - II) to 419 sexual offenders and 172 community as well as incarcerated controls. This was one of the few personality studies on sex offenders that did not use the MMPI. Significantly more proportion of sex offenders reached the clinical cut - off for Schizoid - Asocial, Avoidant, Dependent - Submissive and Passive Aggressive - Negativistic scales. However, few elevations were observed on Narcissistic and Compulsive - Conforming scales. Sexual offenders were also significantly more anxious and dysthymic. Nonetheless, there were few differences among different groups of sex offenders.

Chantry and Craig (1994) also administered the MCMI - II to 201 child molesters, 195 rapists and 205 non - sexual assaulters. Both groups of sex offenders were more passive - aggressive, but the child molesters were more dependent, anxious and depressed than the rapists and non - sexual assaulters, whose personality style was more narcissistic and independent with little psychic distress. Consistent with earlier findings based on the MMPI (e.g. Erickson et al., 1987), the psychological characteristics of rapists were more similar to those of the non - sexual assaulters than to the other sexual offenders.

Research reviewed so far failed to identify the “ typical ” personality profiles that characterized sex offenders. Although rapists were repeatedly reported to be anti - social, odd and acting out with more 4-8/8-4 and 4-9/9-4 MMPI code types (Rader, 1977; Erickson et al, 1987), they accounted for no more than 20% of the cases and these profiles were equally common among other prison samples (Erickson et al., 1987). On the other hand, the group profile of exhibitionists usually fell with the normal range and they were considered as less disturbed than the rapists (Rader, 1977). In spite of some evidence from qualitative studies suggesting the low self - esteem, shyness and unassertiveness of non - violent sexual offenders convicted of indecent exposure or assault (Lu, 1987 ; Blair & Richard, 1981), strong empirical support for such a notion was lacking.

As commented by Levin and Lawrence (1987), such heterogeneous and inconsistent findings regarding the personality of rapists and exhibitionists were hard to interpret due to methodological and conceptual problems. Firstly, most of the studies on sex offenders failed to take into consideration of subtypes among them. People convicted of the same offense differed from one another in terms of their past sexual and criminal history. Such features had already proven to correlate with personality variables such as anti - social tendency (Forgac & Michaels, 1982). Collapsing the subtypes into one single group was thus likely to yield futile results. Besides, MMPI seemed to be more appropriately viewed as a measure of psychopathology rather than personality. The use of well - researched personality inventory was thus strongly indicated for future studies.

Other related constructs of personalities

Axis I Clinical Disorders

Clinical syndromes were closely associated with personality as they were thought to be evolved from one's basic personality pattern (Millon, 1994). Research on this area consistently showed that sexual deviance often co - occurred with a history of physical / sexual abuse (Hanson & Slater, 1988), substance abuse (Langevin & Langa, 1990; Mio, Nanjundappa, Verleur & et al., 1986), mood disorders, early onset dysthymia, anxiety disorders and social phobia (Kafka & Prentky, 1994). While physical / sexual abuse experience provided model for aggression and sexual deviance, substance abuse and negative moods served as transitory disinhibitors which tempted men of sexual deviance to give up self - control over impulse and act out their fantasies.

Social Relationship

As personality traits often manifested themselves in interpersonal context, a comprehensive work on personality profiling would not be completed without studying social relationship. Personality research had revealed the social inadequacy of sex offenders. These included being fearful of social involvement, unassertive and heterosexually maladjusted (Blair & Richard, 1981; Lu, 1987), and having low social intelligence to communicate and empathize (Rader, 1977). All these limited their abilities and confidence in forming intimate relationship, giving rise to a sense of loneliness which was commonly observed among sex offenders (Marshall, 1989).

Garlick (1991), for example, administered the UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell, Peplau & Cutrona, 1980), Tesch's Intimacy Questionnaire (1985) and a

measure of the attribution of blame concerning the ending of intimate relationship to a groups of sex offenders. They found that child molesters were less able to form intimate relation and more lonely than non - sex offenders, with rapists' scores falling in between of the two groups. Besides, both groups of sexual offenders blamed women for the loss of intimate relationships, and saw factors outside themselves as causing their loneliness.

Seidman, Marshall, Hudson and Robertson (1992) differentiated child molesters and rapists from other populations on the degree of loneliness they experienced. In their first study on non - incarcerated population, they administered the Revised UCLA loneliness scale, Miller's Social Intimacy scale (Miller & Lefcourt, 1982), the Marlowe - Crowne Social Desirability Scale - Form C (Reynolds, 1982) and other measures relating to hostility to 18 community controls, 15 university students, 15 incest offenders, 15 nonfamilial child molesters, 17 rapists, 18 exhibitionists, and 15 wife batterers. All of these sexual offenders admitted to their sexual crimes. After controlling for social desirability, the pooled sex offenders groups were found to have significantly higher loneliness and intimacy deficit than the community controls.

Similar results were replicated in their second study on incarcerated offenders. Child molesters ($n = 29$) and rapists ($n = 18$) were significantly more lonely and less likely to form intimate relationship than a group of nonsexual offenders with an extensive crimes history ($n = 41$). As the nonsexual control were likely to be in prison several times while this was not so true for the sexual offenders, the latter's

higher level of loneliness might be a reaction to their first incarceration that separated them from their social network.

Even though the majority of sex offenders claimed themselves as having a current marriage or courtship, Bownes (1993) found that among 74 sex offenders, 62% of them experienced marital / relationship dysfunction basing on their scores on Golombok - Rust Inventory of Marital Satisfaction.

In summary, there were evidence for the co - occurrence of depressive mood, anxiety, traumatic childhood experience and substance abuses with sexual deviation (Kafka & Prentky, 1994; Langevin & Langa, 1990; Hanson & Slater, 1988 ; Mio et al., 1986). On top of that, consistent with some of the studies on personalities, research on social relationship of sex offenders suggested their difficulties in forming intimate relationship and loneliness (Kafka & Prentky, 1994 ; Bownes, 1993 ; Seidman et al., 1992 ; Garlick, 1991;).

The Purpose of Present Research

As could be seen, many research focused on searching for the personality characteristics of sex offenders. Since mandatory psychological services were provided for the sex offenders, and because of their high incidence of denial (Lu, 1987), knowledge on their psychological characteristics were thus of important values in assessment, designing treatment and predicting recidivism. As reviewed, the great majority of studies on sex offenders involved administering MMPI to the rapists, exhibitionists and child molesters. However, research on people convicted of frotteurs was scarce. The present study thus represented an preliminary attempt to identify the personality profiles of people committed frotteurism as compared to rapists and

incarcerated controls. The findings would be of clinical significance as these people was likely to be convicted of indecent assault which formed the greatest group of local sex offenses (Crime & Enforcement Report, 1996).

To overcome some of the conceptual and methodological problems commonly encountered in past research as mentioned by Levin and Lawrence (1987), the present study would take into consideration of subtypes within groups and use inventory that focused more on assessing both personality and psychopathology.

Studies reviewed so far consistently depicted the personality profiles of exhibitionists as generally less deviant than the rapists. However, there were data suggested their social incompetence. Since frotteurism often co - occurred with exhibitionism, it was therefore postulated that the frotteurs, like exhibitionists, were generally less disturbed than the rapist and incarcerated control group. Besides, while the rapist group would be more similar to the incarcerated control and displayed anti - social tendency, the frotteur would be characterized by their shyness, submissiveness, unassertiveness and dependence. Furthermore, sexual offenders would be more lonely than the incarcerated control and enjoyed less heterosexual activities.

Methods

Subjects

Twenty two indecent assaulters, 20 rapists and 20 incarcerated controls from the Correctional Services Department participated in the study. Due to the small number of indecent assault convicts, all of them were invited to participate in the present projects on a voluntary basis. Response rate was well over 90%. For the

rapist and incarcerated control group, they were being selected as their ages matched those of the indecent assault convicts.

Table 1 offered detailed descriptions of the offense nature of various groups of offenders. For the 22 participants convicted of indecent assault, their offenses ranged from touching female body parts in public to violent assault falling a little short of rape. Within the indecent assault group, 11 of them committed frotteurism. They touched adult female (age over 16) body parts without consent in crowded places such as public transport and shopping mall. Six other participants involved in non - frotteurism indecency towards

Table 1
Nature of Offenses among Different Groups of Offenders

Total Population (N = 62)		
Indecent Assault (n = 22)	Rape (n = 20)	Incarcerated controls (n = 20)
1. Frotteur's Acts (n = 11)	1. Attempted Rape (n = 4)	1. Robbery (n = 13)
2. Non - Frotteur's Acts (n = 6)	2. Gang Rape (n = 7)	2. Physical Assault (n = 5)
3. Child Molestation (n = 4)	3. Solo Rape (n = 7)	3. Manslaughter (n = 1)
4. Unknown (n = 1)	4. Incest (n = 1)	4. Arson (n = 1)
	5. Date Rape (n = 1)	

adult women. These incidents usually took place in quiet places where only the offender and the victim were present. In some cases, considerable force were employed by the offenders to obtain victims' compliance. Their acts were therefore considered as deviated from the typical frotteurism. The remaining indecent assaulters included four child molesters and one offender of which the offense nature was unknown. For the 20 rapists, four of them were convicted of attempted rape. For those who were accused of rape, there were seven gang rapists, seven solo rapists, one incestuous father and one date rapist. For the 20 incarcerated controls, 13 committed robbery, five involved in physical assault, one was charged with manslaughter and the remaining one was accused of arson.

Though members of indecent assault group shared the same conviction, their offense were rather heterogeneous. To streamline the classification and increase group homogeneity, only indecent assault convicts who committed frotteurism ($n = 11$) were retained in the frotteurs group. The incestuous offender was also excluded from statistical analysis, making the new rapists group comprised of 19 members. No amendment was made to the incarcerated control group.

Measures

MCMI - III (Millon, 1994)

The Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory - III (MCMI - III) is a self-administered test that assesses for both DSM - IV's Axis I psychopathology and Axis II personality disorders (see Appendix I). It was a personality test that designed specially for the clinical population. The inventory comprises of 175 items that are scored to produce 28 scales divided into the following categories : Modifying

Indices, Clinical Personality Patterns, Severe Personality Pathology, Clinical Syndromes and Severe Syndromes (Appendix II). Scores obtained are adjusted for respondent's defensiveness, anxiety and depression. It is more preferable than the other instruments because of its correspondence to the current diagnostic criteria as specified by the DSM - IV. Besides, it is theoretically based and well - researched. Since its original publication in 1977, it has stimulated over 600 published papers on or using it and has become one of the more frequently used tests in clinical practice (Piotrowski & Zalewski, 1993 ; Watkins et al., 1995).

As presented in the manual (Millon, 1994), MCMI demonstrated excellent internal consistency with alpha coefficients ranged from .66 for Compulsive scale to .90 for Major Depression. Alpha exceeded .80 for 20 of the 26 scales. Besides, all of its scales attained a test - retest reliability of at least .82. Moreover, it also displayed expected correlations with various related instruments, some of which included the Beck Depression Inventory, Symptom Checklist - 90, and the MMPI.

MCMI was proven to be useful in correctional settings. Stability estimates for MCMI scales and factor structures with offenders were found to be similar to that seen among clinical populations (Langevin et al., 1988; Lengevin et al., 1979). Besides, Zerella, Schuerger, and Ritz (1990) reported significant association between MCMI scales and MMPI scales within a correctional setting.

Subjects were asked to indicate whether each statement in MCMI was true for them on a dichotomous scale. Higher scores indicated greater possibility of having a certain personality trait or clinical syndrome.

UCLA Loneliness Scale - III (Russell, 1993)

The UCLA Loneliness Scale - III is a 20 - item instrument designed to assess the general feeling of loneliness among adolescents, adults and elderly populations (see Appendix III). Test - retest correlation over one year period was .73 and internal consistency ranged from .89 to .94 (Russell, 1993). It enjoyed good concurrent validity with a number of mood and personality measures (e.g. the Beck Depression Inventory, the Texas Social Behavior Inventory), and particularly with a self - labeling loneliness index. In the present study, the Chinese version of the UCLA Loneliness Scale - III (Tang & Lam, 1993) was adopted. Subjects were asked to indicate how often each statement was true for them on a four- point Linkert scale that ranged from never feel (1) to always feel (4). Higher UCLA Loneliness scores reflected greater loneliness.

Table 2 contrasted the present internal consistency of MCMI scales and UCLA loneliness scale with those reported by Millon (1994) and Russell

Table 2

Internal Consistency of MCMI Scales and UCLA Loneliness Scale

	Present α	Original α		Present α	Original α
Schizoid	.72	.81	Anxiety	.86	.86
Avoidant	.86	.89	Somatoform	.79	.86
Depressive	.88	.89	Bipolar Manic	.77	.71
Dependent	.70	.85	Dysthymia	.82	.88
Histrionic	.75	.81	Alcohol Dependence	.72	.82
Narcissistic	.76	.67	Drug Dependence	.85	.83
Antisocial	.80	.77	PTSD*	.91	.89
Aggressive	.80	.79	Thought Disorder	.84	.87
Compulsive	.70	.66	Major Depression	.86	.90
Negativistic	.82	.83	Delusional Disorder	.79	.79
Self defeating	.85	.87	Disclosure	-	-
Schizotypal	.84	.85	Desirability	.81	.86
Borderline	.82	.85	Debasement	.91	.95
Paranoid	.86	.84	UCLA Loneliness	.85	.89 - .94

(1993). All the alphas of the present studies were over .70. In general, they were comparable to those reported by the tests' authors.

Structure Interview

Each subjects was individually interviewed in which information concerning their background, heterosexual activities, offense nature and past convictions were collected (see Appendix IV).

Procedure

Subjects were read out the same instruction before they filled in the questionnaires themselves. The instruction explained the purpose of the study, stressing that the survey was anonymous, and assuring the subjects that all information would only be used for research purpose. They would then be individually interviewed by the researcher for about 30 minutes.

Results

Background information of the subjects

Table 3 presented the age and years of education for the frotteurs, rape and incarcerated control group. The mean age for the frotteurs, rapists and incarcerated controls were 31.0 ($sd = 9.3$), 28.4 ($sd = 8.8$) and 28.5 ($sd = 5.6$) respectively, showing no significant difference. The frotteurs were, however, attained significantly higher education than the incarcerated controls, $F(2, 48) = 3.9, p = .03$. The former received, on average, 10 years of education ($sd = 2.8$) while the latter got 7.8 years ($sd = 1.8$). Frotteurs also secured jobs of higher socio - economic status than the other two groups.

Table 3

The Mean Age and Years of Education for the Frotteur, Rapist and Incarcerated Control Group

	Frotteur (n = 11)	Rapist (n = 19)	Control (n = 20)	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Age	31.0 (9.3)	28.4 (8.8)	28.5 (5.6)	.46	.63
Years of Education	10.0 ^a (2.8)	8.2 ^{a b} (2.0)	7.8 ^b (1.8)	3.9	.03

Different superscript indicated significant group difference.

While six out of eleven (54.5%) of frotteurs held an office work, all but two in the other two groups took up manual works.

Table 4 depicted the marital status of the three groups. Seventy five point five percent of all the participants were bachelor. Sixteen point three percent of them did get married and the remaining 8.2 % had already been separated / divorced. No significant difference in marital status were found among various groups of offenders.

Table 5 presented the criminal history and confession among the three groups of offenders. Within the frotteur group, 45.5% claimed to be first offenders, 54.5% admitted previous sexual offenses but none had previous nonsexual crime records. This was in contrast with the rapist group as 52.6 % of them were previously caught for other nonsexual crimes. Two rapists had both previous sexual and nonsexual

offenses. Since their crimes were closely related to sexual offenses (robbing the victim after the rape), they were therefore counted as sexual recidivists. Finally, for the nonsexual offender group, they all denied previous sexual crime record.

As for confession for the present conviction, while 72.7% of the frotteurs and 78.9% of the rapists denied or minimized their offenses, only 5.6% of the incarcerated controls did not admitted their crimes. Significantly more frotteurs and rapists than incarcerated controls denied or minimized their offenses, $\chi^2 (4, N = 48) = 22.9, p = .00$.

Table 4

Marital Status of the Frotteur, Rapist and Control Group

	Frotteur (n = 11)	Rape (n = 19)	Control (n = 19)	Total (n = 49)
Never Married	9 (81.8%)	14 (73.7%)	14 (73.7%)	37 (75.5%)
Married	2 (18.2%)	3 (15.8%)	3 (15.8%)	8 (16.3 %)
Divorce	0 (0%)	2 (10.5%)	2 (10.5%)	4 (8.2 %)

Differences in marital status among subjects were non - significant, $\chi^2 (4, N= 49) = 1.3, p = .87$.

As over 20% of the cells had an expected frequency that was less than five, the χ^2 estimation should be interpreted with caution.

Figures in parenthesis represented percentages of the subjects from one of the three groups having a certain marital status.

Table 5

Criminal History and Confession of Frotteur, Rapist and Control Group

	Frotteur	Rapist	Control	χ^2	p
Past Criminal Records				16.8	.00
first offenders	5 (45.5%)	5 (26.3%)	8 (44.4%)		
sexual recidivists	6 (54.5%)	4 (21.1%)	0 (0%)		
nosexual recidivists	0 (0%)	10 (52.6%)	10 (55.6%)		
Confession				22.9	.00
admitters	3 (27.3%)	4 (21.1%)	17 (94.4%)		
deniers	8 (72.7%)	15 (78.9%)	1 (5.6%)		

Scores for MCMI scales

The raw scores of the three Modifying Indices for the three groups were presented in Table 6. Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) indicated no significant differences in the three Modifying Indices among different groups of offenders. Univariate test revealed the discrepancy between sexual and nonsexual offense group were approaching significance in Disclosure scale. Frotteurs ($\bar{x} = 94.2$) and rapists ($\bar{x} = 99.3$) scored seemingly lower than the controls ($\bar{x} = 117.8$). As lower the scores indicated higher degree of defensiveness, the result suggested that sex offenders tended to be more reserved in filling the inventories.

Table 7 showed the mean base rates of Clinical Personality Patterns and Severe Personality Pathology among frotteur, rapist and nonsexual offender group. Base rates were standardized scores that anchored to the prevalence of a particular attributes that a scale was intended to measure. For personality disorders, a base rate of 75 indicated the presence of a trait while 85 indicated the presence of a disorder. Sex offenders scored significantly lower than the incarcerated controls in Antisocial { $F (2, 49) = 8.6, p = .00$ } and Aggressive { $F (2, 49) = 10.3, p = .00$ } scales. These suggested that the former group were comparatively more willing to conform to social norms and less intimidating and dominating. Frotteurs and rapists also had higher standard deviations than the incarcerated controls in the above scales, indicating that the former groups were comparatively more heterogeneous in these domains.

Table 6

Mean Raw Scores (and Standard Deviations) of Modifying Indices among Frotteur, Rapist and Control Group

	Frotteur	Rapist	Control	F	p
<u>Modifying Indices</u>					
Disclosure	94.2 (22.9)	99.3 (35.6)	117.8 (29.8)	2.7	.08
Desirability	14.7 (2.7)	14.8 (4.8)	14.4 (4.8)	.06	.94
Debasement	9.2 (4.8)	8.1 (7.4)	11.3 (7.3)	1.1	.34

Table 7

Mean Base Rates (and Standard Deviations) of Clinical Personality Patterns and
Severe Personality Pathology among Frotteur, Rapist and Control Group

	Frotteur	Rapist	Control	F	p
Clinical Personality Patterns					
Schizoid	62.0 (15.9)	53.5 (25.8)	67.2 (17.5)	2.1	.13
Avoidant	61.1 (28.6)	53.7 (27.5)	54.0 (28.5)	.29	.75
Depressive	61.1 (31.2)	62.2 (28.9)	64.3 (25.8)	.05	.95
Dependent	68.0 (16.3)	52.9 (23.7)	63.1 (15.7)	2.5	.10
Histrionic	42.8 (12.0)	44.1 (17.7)	41.5 (16.9)	.11	.89
Narcissistic	47.6 (15.0)	50.6 (20.0)	58.0 (25.9)	.97	.39
Antisocial	35.2 (22.0) ^a	48.7 (23.9) ^a	67.3 (18.6) ^b	8.6	.00
Aggressive	45.6 (19.4) ^a	40.6 (21.1) ^a	64.0 (8.0) ^b	10.3	.00
Compulsive	54.9 (7.9)	50.1 (15.7)	44.4 (14.3)	2.2	.12
Negativistic	62.6 (13.4)	60.0 (27.0)	72.3 (15.7)	1.9	.16
Self-defeating	54.7 (23.4)	54.7 (28.4)	65.6 (24.0)	1.1	.35
Severe Personality Pathology					
Schizotypal	40.3 (26.7)	40.1 (31.1)	57.2 (22.6)	2.4	.10
Borderline	43.6 (22.4)	48.8 (28.0)	60.0 (21.2)	1.9	.16
Paranoid	48.4 (23.5)	45.5 (27.8)	62.6 (23.8)	2.5	.10

Different superscript indicated significant group difference.

For frotteurs, they attained highest scores in Dependent, Negativistic, Schizoid, Avoidant and Depressive scales. People as such were often described as unconfident and unassertive with prevailing sullenness and negativism. Interpersonally, they were loner, being socially anxious and hypersensitive to rejection and negative evaluation.

For rapists, they scored highest on Depressive and Negativistic scales. People as such often described as pessimistic with a sense of self - worthlessness. They were also obstructive, sullen, negativistic and felt being victimized and misunderstood.

For the incarcerated controls, their scores for Negativistic, Antisocial and Schizoid scales were the highest. In particular, their group mean base rate for Negativistic scale was 72.3, which was approaching to the clinical cut - off. People as such had a strong sense of obstructiveness, sullenness and negativism. Besides, they were unwilling to conform to social norms and would be unlikely to feel guilty and remorseful for their irresponsible, manipulative, deceitful and aggressive behaviours. Interpersonally, they were likely to detached from social relationships.

Table 8 displayed the mean base rates of Clinical and Severe syndromes for different offense groups. For clinical syndromes, a base rate of 75 indicated presence and 85 indicated prominence of a disorder. Both groups of sex offenders scored significantly lower in Drug Dependence scale { $F(2, 49) =$

Table 8

Mean Base Rate (and Standard Deviation) of Clinical and Severe Syndromes among
Frotteur, Rapist and Control Group

	Frotteur	Rapist	Control	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Clinical Syndromes</u>					
Anxiety	66.9 (34.3)	49.8 (35.9)	74.5 (26.9)	2.9	.06
Somatoform	43.0 (22.6)	28.5 (27.2)	48.7 (27.0)	3.0	.06
Bipolar Manic	36.4 (20.4) ^a	44.2 (21.5) ^{ab}	56.1 (17.7) ^b	3.9	.03
Dysthymia	58.9 (20.0)	58.6 (23.2)	67.3 (18.6)	1.0	.37
Alcohol Dependence	51.9 (24.1)	59.6 (21.7)	68.1 (16.8)	2.3	.11
Drug Dependence	29.0 (19.2) ^a	44.8 (25.1) ^a	68.4 (19.2) ^b	12.9	.00
PTSD*	51.6 (23.5)	46.3 (30.3)	56.0 (27.3)	.60	.55
<u>Severe Syndromes</u>					
Thought Disorder	53.5 (22.5) ^{ab}	48.1 (23.8) ^a	64.1(12.4) ^b	3.3	.05
Major Depression	47.1 (27.6)	38.3 (29.4)	49.6 (29.2)	.79	.46
Delusional Disorder	37.9 (25.5)	40.4 (27.5)	57.6 (23.0)	3.1	.06

* PTSD stands for Post - Traumatic Stress Disorder

Different superscript indicated significant group difference.

12.9, $p = .00$ } indicating that the former groups were less likely to have a recurrent / current drug dependence history. For frotteurs, they had significantly lower scores than controls on Bipolar Manic scale { $F(2, 49) = 3.9, p = .03$ }, suggesting that frotteurs were less likely to experience periods of superficial elation, inflated self-esteem, restless overactivity, distractibility, pressured of speech, impulsiveness and irritability. Finally, the control scored significantly higher than rapists on Thought Disorder scale { $F(2, 49) = 3.3, p = .05$ }, revealing the former's odd thinking compared to latter.

For the frotteurs, they scored highest on Anxiety and Dysthymia scales. These suggested their feeling of tension during the time of testing. Besides, they were likely to be in low mood for the past few years.

Rapists, on the other hand, obtained highest scores in Alcohol Dependence and Dysthymia scales. Like frotteurs, their mood had probably been “down in the dumps” for the recent past. They were likely to cope with their negative mood by drinking.

As for the incarcerated control, their scores were highest in Anxiety, Drug Dependence, Alcohol Dependence, Dysthymia and Thought Disorder (psychosis characterized by disorganization and confusion) scales. In particular, their group mean score for Anxiety scale was 75.5, which almost reached the clinical cut - off of 75. Their test results suggested that they were anxious and sad individuals who might rely on alcohol and drug as ways of coping.

Analysis of MCMI code types

Erickson et al. (1987) considered interpretation of mean scores resulted in oversimplistic and stereotypic descriptions of the sex offenders. A complementary way to examine the personality of the offenders would be studied their variety of code types. Code types represented elevations of individual profiles and signified the prominent personality characteristics of an individual. In the present study, code types would be any scale that had a base rate of at least 59 and its score was the highest two within an individual profile. In case of a tie, all the scales with equal scores would be considered as counted.

Table 9 illustrated the frequency of code types among frotteur, rapist and nonsexual offender groups. Group differences in the proportion of scale involvement in code types were noted on Antisocial { $\chi^2 (2, N = 50) = 9.1, p = .01$ }, Dependent { $\chi^2 (2, N = 50) = 5.8, p = .05$ }, Negativistic { $\chi^2 (2, N = 50) = 5.9, p = .05$ } and marginally on Avoidant { $\chi^2 (2, N = 50) = 5.4, p = .07$ } scale.

For frotteur group, 54.5% of them peaked at Avoidant (being socially withdrawn for fear of rejection), 45.5% at Dependent (being unconfident and having the tendency to please others through clinging behaviours and submissiveness) and 36.4% at Depressive (feeling worthless and pessimistic) and 27.3 % at Schizoid (socially detached with little interest in people) scales.

Table 9

Percentage and (Frequency) of Individual Clinical Personality Patterns Involved as

Code type Among Frotteur, Rapist and Incarcerated Control Group

	Frotteur (n = 11)	Rapist (n = 19)	Control (n = 20)	χ^2	p
Schizoid*	27.3% (3)	15.8% (3)	20.0% (4)	.57	.75
Avoidant	54.5% (6)	36.8% (7)	15.0% (3)	5.4	.07
Depressive	36.4% (4)	47.4% (9)	20.2% (4)	3.3	.19
Dependent*	45.5% (5)	10.5% (2)	15.0% (3)	5.8	.05
Histrionic*	0% (0)	10.5% (2)	0% (0)	3.4	.18
Narcissistic*	18.2% (2)	5.3% (1)	20.0%(4)	2.0	.37
Antisocial*	0% (0)	5.3 (1)	35.0% (7)	9.1	.01
Aggressive	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	-	-
Compulsive*	0% (0)	15.8% (3)	5.0% (1)	2.8	.25
Negativistic	9.1% (1)	26.3% (5)	50.0% (10)	5.9	.05
Self defeating*	0% (0)	26.3% (5)	15.0% (3)	3.6	.16

* As over 20% of the cells had an expected frequency that was less than five, the χ^2 estimation should be interpreted with caution.

Indeed, among the 11 profiles of the frotteurs, 3 were Avoidant - Depressive, 2 were Avoidant - Dependent and 1 were Depressive -Dependent.

The code types of rapists were more heterogeneous and they peaked on a wider variety of scales. Their most frequent code types were Depressive (feeling worthless and pessimistic ; 47.4%), Avoidant (being socially withdrawn for fear of rejection ;

36.8%), Negativistic (sullen and feeling of being victimized ; 26.3%) and Self - Defeating (constantly put oneself in situations where one will be the victim ; 26.3%) scales. Finally, most incarcerated controls scored highest on Negativistic (sullen and feeling of being victimized ; 50%) and Antisocial (unwillingness to conform to social norms ; 35%) scales.

As in some chi - square analyses, over 20% of the cells had an expected frequency of less than five, the result could only be considered as tentative.

Loneliness and Heterosexual Variables Gathered from Interviews

Table 10 summarized the degree of loneliness and the heterosexual variables that gathered from individual interview for different groups. No significant difference in the degree of loneliness was found between the two sex offenders groups and their incarcerated counterparts. Nonetheless, groups differed in terms of their heterosexual activities. Using Wilks' Lambda statistic, a significant multivariate effect was found for number of courtship, $\Lambda = .64$, $F (2, 33) = 7.4$, $p = .00$. The two sex offender groups had significantly few number of courtship than their nonsexual counterpart.

Table 10

Degree of Loneliness and Heterosexual Variables of the Frotteur, Rapist
and Incarcerated Control Group

Scales / Item	Frotteur	Rapist	Control	F	p
UCLA Loneliness Scale	40.3 (6.8)	44.0 (10.0)	45.1 (6.5)	1.3	.29
Number of female friends	2.2 (3.4)	1.1 (1.5)	1.5 (3.3)	.54	.59
Number of courtship	1.7 ^a (1.9)	2.4 ^a (1.5)	5.7 ^b (3.8)	7.4	.00

Different superscripts indicated significant group differences in post hoc comparison.
Figures in parenthesis were standard deviation.

Indeed, four out of 11 frotteurs and one out of nineteen rapists never had a girlfriend. This was in contrast with the incarcerated control as all of them had at least one courtship. There were little differences between groups in terms of the number of female friends they had.

Table 11 showed the percentage of men admitted to have heterosexual difficulties among various groups. Twenty seven point three percent of the frotteurs and 21.1% of the rapist admitted to have problems in getting along with female. This was in contrast with the incarcerated controls as they all denied having any difficulty. The difference between sexual and non - sexual offenders were approaching significant, $\chi^2(2, N = 50) = 5.65, p = .06$.

Table 11

Percentage and (Number) of Men Admitted Heterosexual Difficulties Among

Various Groups of Offenders

	Frotteur (n = 11)	Rapist (n = 19)	Control (n = 20)
Admitted heterosexual problems	27.3% (3)	21.1% (4)	0% (0)
Denied heterosexual problems	72.7% (8)	78.9% (15)	100% (20)

As over 20% of the cells had an expected frequency that was less than five, the χ^2 estimation should be interpreted with caution.

Discussion

The present study examined the personality profiles of people committed frotteurism as compared to the rapists and incarcerated controls. In brief, the hypothesis that the frotteur group was least disturbed among the three groups were only partially supported. Although they generally displayed lesser clinical syndromes than the incarcerated control, there was no evidence that they were psychologically more healthier than the rapists. There was suggestive evidence pointing to the social fear and submissiveness of the frotteur group. However, the two sexual offender groups did not scored higher on the loneliness scale than their nonsexual offense counterpart despite preliminary evidence hinting their fewer heterosexual activities and more interpersonal difficulties.

Background of the Frotteur in the Present Sample

In the present sample, most of the members of the frotteur group were in their twenty to thirty, though one of the members was as old as 56. They were better educated than the incarcerated controls. Besides, six out of eleven (54.5%) of them held a office work. This was in contrast with the other two offense group in which all but two take up manual works. Majority of the frotteur group had never married and this was comparable to the other two groups.

Fifty - four point five percent ($n = 6$) of those committed frotteurism were sexual recidivists. They had been convicted for indecent assault for, on average, more than twice. Nonetheless, none of them had been previously caught for nonsexual offense. Except perhaps their deviant sexual behaviours, frotteurs appeared to be law - abiding citizens with little anti - social tendency. This was in contrast with the rapists

as 50% of them had a nonsexual crime record. There was likely to be a subgroup of rapists whose sexual offending represented one way of their anti - social acting out. This appeared to fit in Lu's (1987) hypothesis that sexual offending for rapists represented a generalized pattern of acting out, whereas those of the indecent assault convicts appeared to stem from social inadequacy and heterosexual maladjustment.

Despite their repeated convictions, most of the frotteurs and rapists denied committing the present offense. As sexual offenses were particularly associated with shame and disgrace, according to Happel and Joseph (1995), sex offenders denied their offenses in order to avoid embarrassment, inadequacy, responsibility and guilt. Denial might also save them from disapproval and rejection of family and friends. Even though some of the sex offenders might be sensitive about their deviance, they were afraid to admit the truth even to themselves. Salter (1988) suggested that magical thinking might be at work, whereby sex offenders thought that sexual deviance did not occur until they admitted it. Moreover, denial might be their means of survival in prison as sex offenders were often despised and bullied by other inmates in correctional institutes.

As a result, frotteurs and rapists blamed either the victims or the police for scapegoating them. As deniers also tended to minimize their clinical symptoms (Grossman & Cavanaugh, 1990), their tests scores should be interpreted with caution. For the minority who admitted their offense, one of them confessed committing the crime to combat boredom and dysthymic mood. As detection was thought to be difficult, he could escape from punishment most of time. Legal charges alone were thus unlikely to effectively deter him from committing frotteurism again.

Members of the frotteur group all chose strangers as their victims. All of them touched female body parts in public. None of them admitted rubbing their genitals against women. They all committed the act without using threat or inflicted injuries to the victims.

Personality Problems and Clinical Syndromes of Frotteurs as Compared to Rapists and Controls

The hypothesis that frotteur group was least disturbed among the three groups were only partially supported. Although they generally displayed lesser clinical syndromes than the incarcerated controls, there were no evidence that they were psychologically more healthier than the rapists.

Comparison between two sexual offense groups on personality dimensions revealed more similarities than differences. On no MCMI personality and syndromes scales were their differences significant. Such a finding was a bit unexpected given the greater degree of psychopathology among rapists than the exhibitionists as observed by Rader (1977). Compared to the incarcerated controls, both frotteurs and rapists scored significantly lower than the incarcerated controls in Antisocial, Aggressive and Drug Dependence scales. These suggested that the sex offenders, as a group, might be relatively more willing to conform to social norms in general and less intimidating and dominating than the general prison population. They were also less likely to have a current or recurrent drug history. Such a result was, however, inconsistent with existing literature (Langavin, 1988 ; Chantry and Craig, 1994) which found no significant difference in the scores of Antisocial scale for rapists and incarcerated control. Weinrott and Saylor (1991) even suggested the

possible hidden extensive criminality of sex offenders. In their anonymous survey, all rapists and about 75% of child molesters disclosed at least one undetected nonsex offense. Although most of these self - reported crimes were minor ones (such as public drunkenness, concealed weapon, supply drugs to minors), the average number of offenses per man was 304.8 for rapists and 121 for child molesters!

Possible explanation for such a large discrepancies between past and present research included subject selection, methodological issues, the presence of subtypes among sex offenders and cultural difference. Studies that employed rapists or psychopaths with deviant sexual interest rather than other non -violent sex criminals as subjects would possibly observe a stronger antisocial tendency for sex offenders. Besides, the use of anonymous questionnaires rather than face to face interview would be easier for the research participants to disclose their undetected criminal history. Moreover, although the mean score for Antisocial scale was significantly lower for sex offenders, large within group variability was noted, suggesting the presence of subtypes among sex offenders. It was possible that some sex offenders exhibited criminal versatility while other merely committed sexual offense. Finally, the gap between present and past study might represent a genuine cultural differences in sexual offending between the East and the West that warranted further investigation.

Group Profiles Interpretation

In interpreting personality profiles, the overall configuration of profiles were as important as the absolute test scores. For frotteurs, considerable portion of them primed at Avoidant (54.5 %), Dependent (45.5 %) Depressive (36.4 %) and scales. Such a code type pattern was generally in accordance with their high scores in these

scales. Incidentally, they mostly belonged to DSM - IV Cluster C “ anxious and fearful ” personalities. In addition, a quarter of them (27.3 %) also peaked at Schizoid scale.

According to Millon (1994), Choca, Shanley and Denburg (1992), and Groth - Marnat (1997), people with peaks on these scales were likely to perceived themselves as inadequate, worthless and unattractive. Interpersonally, they were loner and appeared to have little interest in people. Nonetheless, deep down their hearts, they yearned for love and acceptance but were hypersensitive to the possibility of rejection and humiliation. In particular, high scorers on Dependent scale not only aspired to be socially involved, they had a strong need to look for someone whom they could completely rely on. Although their ambivalence towards people might made them sensitive to the needs and perspectives of others, it made them often anxious, if not fearful, and guarded in social situations. To protect themselves from their social anxiety, those peaked on Avoidant scale would restrict their social environments, constantly maintaining their distance and privacy. For those primed on Dependent scale, they would be overly submissive and agreeable in order to secure their relationship with others. Negative feelings were likely to be covered up as they feared the possibility of losing friends. All these led to more problems than help as it undercut future opportunities of enhancing relationships and alienated them from others. They were likely to feel lonely, isolated and depressed. Their needs for affection and anger were likely to be denied or gratified through fantasies.

In terms of clinical syndromes experienced during the time of testing, frotteurs were feeling anxious and tense. Besides, their mood was likely to be low for the

recent past. The finding was in line with Kafka and Prentky's (1994) observation that men with paraphilias had an elevated lifetimes prevalence of early - onset dysthymia (feeling depressed for at least two years with onset before age 21 years) and anxiety disorders, especially social phobia. The possibility of feeling apprehensive and dejected was further heightened during the period of their imprisonment.

In working with people of such a personality profile, a potential difficulty would be their defensiveness. They were likely to revealed only those information that they believed would not lead to rejection by the therapists. For those with a prominent dependent trait, clinging relationship with the therapists were likely to evolved if the latter responded in an authoritative, comforting and assertive manner. Conducting effective psychotherapy with them thus demanded careful balancing of support and confrontation as well as cautious safeguard of client's self determination.

The code types of rapists and incarcerated controls were more heterogeneous than the frotteurs, probably because they encompassed people that committed a variety of offenses with different motivations behind. Like frotteurs, many rapists in the present sample were also peaked at Depressive and Avoidant scales. Their other elevations also included Negativistic and Self - Defeating scale. People with such a profile were likely to have an enduring sense of worthlessness and be sensitive to negative evaluation and rejection from others. On top of that, they were also characterized by their sullenness, negativism, resentment and obsequiousness. In terms of clinical syndromes, they were likely to experience a period of dejection and alcohol abuse.

The present impression that sex offenders' personality profiles was characterized by Dependent, Depressive and Avoidant traits were consistent with previous research using MCMI. Langavin (1988), for instance, noted that significantly more sex offenders than control reached the clinical cut - off of MCMI - II Avoidant and Dependent scales (there was no Depressive scale on the previous MCMI version). In addition, Chantry and Craig (1994) also reported that child molesters as a group scored higher than the control on MCMI - II Dependent, Avoidant, Schizoid and Passive Aggressive scales.

As for the incarcerated control, they were significantly more likely to prime at Antisocial and Negativistic scales. People as such were likely to disregard social norms and the rights of others. They considered the world as jungle and might therefore be deceitful, mistrustful, intimidating and cold. Their other characteristics also included impulsivity and irresponsibility. For those also primed at Negativistic scale, they expressed their anger and resentment through impulsive acting out and antisocial behaviours.

Incarcerated control experienced the widest range of clinical syndromes. These included intense apprehension, dejected mood, alcohol and drug problems as well as confusion and disorganization. While problems with drug and alcohol might be associated with their anti - social life - style, other might represented their reaction to conviction and imprisonment.

As the above interpretation was based on group profiles, given the heterogeneity of each offense group, these descriptions might only be applied to some but not all frotteurs, rapists and non - sex related criminals.

Loneliness and Heterosexual Relationship

Contrary to past research (Garlic, 1992; Seidman, Marshall, Hudson & Robertson, 1992), the hypothesis that sexual offenders were more lonely than the nonsexual counterparts was inconclusive. Unlike the subjects from Seidman et al (1994), only a small portion of the present sample admitted their crimes. Their defensiveness might have motivated them to minimize their interpersonal difficulties.

Though the finding of the UCLA Loneliness scale was inconclusive, there was evidence that pointed to the difficulties of present sex offenders sample in building intimate relationship with female. Though they had more or less the same number of female friends as their nonsexual counterpart, they enjoyed fewer courtship. This was best illustrated by one of the participants who had quite a number of female friends since it, as he described, helped to boost up his masculinity. However, he never managed to have a girlfriend by mid thirties. Like seven other sex offenders, he admitted to have difficulties in relating to female peers since adolescence. They felt uneasy and very self - conscious in getting along with girls. One of these respondents said that he got so nervous that he would easily stutter in conversing with a female.

The Interrelationship of Personality, Loneliness and Sexual Offending

The MCMJ personality profiles of frotteurs as unconfident and socially fearful individuals who longed for intimacy fit well into their own accounts of unsuccessful dating experience. Despite their aspiration for courtship, many of them rarely dated girls for fear of rejection. Some of them shared the belief that girls would only love those men who were handsome and rich. And it was their belief that they were far

from the ideals, reflecting their negative self perception. Even though some managed to have courtship, their partners were more like acquaintances than intimate and supportive companions.

According to Marshall (1989) and Marshall (1993), such an intimacy deficit played a crucial role in the development of sexual offense. It might be originated from the sex offenders' insecure attachment with their primary care givers during childhood. Ainsworth and her colleagues (Bell & Ainsworth ; 1972 Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters & Walls, 1978) observed that, in response to poor quality parent - child relationships, children would developed either an avoidance or an anxious / ambivalent style in relationships for fear of rejection. While a person who avoided intimate contacts would appear as socially alienated, the anxious / ambivalent person would attempt to form intimate relationships, then draw back when things became too intimate and then make approach efforts again when the partner reacted to his withdrawal by distancing themselves. Besides, people with insecure attachment would also have little confidence of themselves as a lovable person. All these fit well into the frotteurs' MCMII profiles as an socially fearful and inadequate individuals, being hypersensitive to abandonment. As adults, their limited capacity for intimacy would most likely manifested in the form of heterosexual / marital difficulties, causing subsequent loneliness.

While in the general theory of sexual offending, Marshall and Barbaree (1990) included biological underpinnings, social - cultural influences, conditioning experiences and transitory disinhibition as factors associated with sexual offending,

Marshall (1993) highlighted that loneliness was the key factor that increased one's susceptibility to these risk factors.

For instance, frotteurs thirst for love coupled with the feeling of social inadequacy drove them to look for quick way to intimacy. These might make them more susceptible to ideas put forward by pornography e.g. pursue sex by violence or equating sex with intimacy, thus putting them at higher risks for sexual offending. Marshall (1989) for example, reported the absurd thought of some rapists and exhibitionists that their victims would fall in love with them. Neubeck (1974), among various motive behind sexual offending, list attaining intimacy as one of the most important one.

Another illustration would be the association between loneliness and aggression towards women. Check, Perlman, and Malamuth (1985) found that among a group of university males, loneliness was found to be significantly related to the acceptance of violence directed at women, hostility towards women, and anger at rejection by a women. They were likely blaming women for their loneliness. On top of that, loneliness significantly predicted self - reported incidents of past sexual aggression and the degree of self - reported likelihood of forcing an unwilling woman to have sex.

Limitation of Present Research and Future Direction

There was a number of factors that hindered the generalization of present result to other sex offenders. Firstly, the present sample size was rather small. Besides, it represented a more disturbed frotteur's sample as some of them had been convicted for

indecent assault more than once. The present finding thus needed further validation and might not be applicable to the non - incarcerated population.

A common obstacle to research on sexual offenders was the respondents' defensiveness. It was unfortunate that research on MCMI - II provided no empirical support for the validity of Disclosure scale in screening for fake good profiles (Retzlaff, Sheehan & Fiel, 1991; Van Gorp & Meyer, 1986). Besides, local norm was not available. Correction for defensiveness made basing on western findings might thus at best an estimation. The present results should only be considered as tentative.

Apart from adjusting the scores according to the degree of defensiveness assessed, other possible way of minimizing the offenders' evasiveness included building rapport with them before administering the inventory. Besides, efforts should be paid to strictly uphold confidentiality. Some possible means included providing quiet testing environment that was free from outside disturbances. Besides, all filled questionnaires should be ideally collected by the researcher instead of by the prison's staff.

References

- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E. & Walls, S. (1978). Patterns of Attachment : A Psychological Study of the Strange Situation. Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- American Psychiatric Association (1996). The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (4th edition). American Psychiatric Association, Washington, D. C.

- Bard, L. A., Carter, D. L., Cerce, D. D., Knight, R. A., Rosenberg, R. & Schneider, B. (1987). A descriptive study of rapists and child molesters, developmental, clinical and criminal characteristics, Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 503 - 220.
- Baxter, D. J., Marshall, W. L., Barbaree, H. E., et al. (1984). Deviant sexual behavior: differentiating sex offenders by criminal and personal history, psychometric measures and sexual response, Criminal Justice and Behavior, 11, 477 - 501.
- Blair, C. D. & Lanyon, R. I. (1981). Exhibitionism : Etiology and Treatment, Psychological Bulletin, 89 (3), 439 - 463.
- Bell, S. M. & Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1972). Infant crying and maternal responsiveness, Child Development, 43, 1171 - 1190.
- Bownes, I. T. (1993). Sexual and relationship dysfunction in sexual offenders, Journal of Sexual and Marital Therapy, 8 (2), 157 - 165.
- Chantry, K. & Craig, R. (1994). Psychological screening of sexually violent offenders with the MCMII, Journal of Clinical Psychology, 50 (3), 430 - 435.
- Check, J. V. P., Perlman, D. and Malamuth, N. M. (1985). Loneliness and aggressive behavior. Journal of Social and Personal Relation, 2, 243 - 252.
- Clark, L. & Lewis, D. J. (1977). Rape: The price of coercive sexuality. Toronto: Canadian women's educational press.
- Christie, M., Marshall, W. & Lanthier, R. (1979). A descriptive study of incarcerated rapists and pedophiles, Report to the Solicitor - General of Canada, cited in Bard, L. A. et al. op. cit.

- Choca, James, P., Shanley, Luke, A., & Denburg, Eric, V. (1992). Interpretative Guide to the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory. American Psychology Association.
- Erickson, W. D., Luxenberg, M. G., Walbek, N. H. & Seely, R. K. (1977). Frequency of MMPI two - point code types among sex offenders, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55 (4), 566 - 570.
- Fagan, P. J., Wise, T. N., & Schmidt, C. W., et al. (1991). A comparison of five - factor personality dimensions in males with sexual dysfunction and males with paraphilia, Journal of Personality Assessment, 57,434 - 448.
- Forgac, D. F., Cassel, C. A., & Michaels, E. J. (1984). Chronicity of criminal behavior and psychopathology in male exhibitionists, Journal of Clinical Psychology, 40, 847 - 832.
- Forgac, G. F. & Michaels, E. J. (1982). Personality characteristics of two types of male exhibitionists, Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 91 (4), 287 - 293.
- Freund, K. (1990). Courtship disorder. In Marshall, W. L., Laws, D. R. & Barbaree, H. E. (Eds). Handbook of Sexual Assaults : Issues, theories and treatment of the offender, pp 201, Plenum Press, New York and London.
- Grossman, Linda, S. & Cavanaugh, James, L. (1990). Psychopathology and denial in alleged sex offenders, Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 178 : 739 - 744.
- Groth - Marnat, Gary (1997). Handbook of Psychological Assessment (Third Edition). John, Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Happel, R. M. & Auffrey, J. J. (1995). Sex offender assessment : interrupting the dance of denial. American Journal of Forensic Psychology, 13 (2), 5 - 22.

- Kafka, M. P., & Robert, R. A. (1994). Preliminary observations of DSM - III - R Axis I comorbidity in men with paraphilias and paraphilia - related disorders, Journal of Clinical Psychiatry, 55 (11), 481 - 487.
- Langevin, R., Lang, R., Reynolds., R., Wright, P., Garrels, D., Marchese, V., Handy, L., Pugh, G., & Frenzel, R. (1988). Personality and sexual anomalies: an examination of the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory. Annals of Sexual Research, 1, 13 - 32.
- Langevin, R., Paitich, D., Freeman, R., Mann, K., and Handy, L. (1978). Personality characteristics and sexual anomalies in males, Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 10: 222 - 238.
- Laws, R. D. & Serber, M. (1975). Measurement and evaluation of assertive training with sexual offenders, in Hosford, R. E., & Moss, C. S. (Eds.) The Crumbling Walls: Treatment and Counseling of Prisoners, pp. 165 - 172. Champaign, IL, University of Illinois Press.
- Levin, S. M. & Lawrence, S. (1987). Personality characteristics of Sex Offenders: A review, Archive of Sexual Behaviours, 16, 57 - 79.
- Lu, Chan, Ching Chuen (1987). Profiles of incarcerated offenders convicted of rape and indecent assault : An exploratory study. In Losel, F., Bender, D., & Bliesener, T. (Eds.) Psychology and Law : International Perspectives, pp 121 - 127. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, Federal Republic of Germany.
- Miller, R. S., & Lefcourt, H. M. (1982). The assessment of social intimacy. Journal of Personality Assessment, 46, 514 - 518.

- Millon, T. (1983). Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Millon, T. (1994). Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory - III : Manual. Minneapolis : National Computer Systems, Inc.
- Mio, J. S., Nanjundappa, G., Verleur, D. E., and et al. (1986). Drug abuse and the adolescent sex offender : a preliminary analysis. Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 18 : 65 - 72.
- Marshall, W. L. (1989). Intimacy, loneliness, and sexual offenders, Behavior Research and Therapy, 27, 491 - 503.
- Marshall, W. L. (1993). The role of attachments, intimacy, and loneliness in the etiology and maintenance of sexual offending. Sexual and Marital Therapy, 8 (2), 109 - 121.
- Marshall, W. L., Christie, M. M. & Lanthier, R. D. (1979). Social Competence, sexual experience and attitudes to sex in incarcerated rapists and pedophiles, Report to Solicitor General of Canada. Ottawa.
- Neubeck, G. (1974). The myriad motives for sex. In Sexual Behavior: Current Issues (Edited by Gross L.). Spectrum Publications, Flushing, N. Y.
- Rader, C. M. (1977). MMPI profile types of expositors, rapists, and assaulters in a court services population, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45 (1), 61 - 69.
- Retzlaff, P. D., Sheehan, E. P., & Fiel, A. (1991). MCMII - II report style and bias : Profile and validity scales analysis. Journal of Personality Assessment, 56, 478 - 486.

- Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe - Crowne social desirability scale. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 38, 119 - 125.
- The Royal Hong Kong Police Force (1996). Crime and Enforcement Report, 29.
- Russell, D. (1993). The UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3) : Reliability and Validity Evidence. Unpublished manuscript, Iowa State University, Center for Family Research in Rural Mental Health, Iowa State.
- Salter, A. C. (1988). Treating Child Sex Offenders and Victims : A Practical Guide. Newbury Park, CA, Sage Publications.
- Segal, Z.V. & Marshall, W. L. (1985). Heterosexual social skills in a population of rapists and child molesters, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53 (1), 55 - 63.
- Stermac, L. E. & Quinsey, V. L. (1985). Social competence among rapists, Behavioral Assessment, 8, 171 - 185.
- Tang S. K. & Lam K. K (1993). Chinese Version of the UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3). Unpublished manuscript, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Tesch, S. A. (1985). The psychosocial intimacy questionnaire : validation studies and an investigation of sex roles, Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 2, 471 - 488.
- Van Corp W. G. (1986). The detection of faking on the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory (MCMII). Journal of Clinical Psychology, 42 (5), 742 - 747.
- Weinrott, M. R. & Saylor, M. (1991). Self - report of crimes committed by sex offenders. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6 (3), 256 - 300.

Appendix II

MCMI - III Scales

Scales	Item no.	Content
<i>Modifying Indices</i>		
1. Disclosure (x)	na	assess frankness
2. Desirability (Y)	21	detect inclination to present oneself in a favorable light
3. Debasement (Z)	33	identify tendency to devalue oneself
4. Validity (V)	3	screen for random responding
<i>Clinical Personality Patterns</i>		
1. Schizoid (1)	16	detached from social relationships, flattened affect, including anhedonia, restricted range of expressed emotions in interpersonal settings.
2. Avoidant (2a)	16	social anxiety, low self - esteem and a hypersensitivity to rejection and negative evaluation.
3. Depressive (2b)	15	gloominess and pessimism, feeling worthless, self - blaming and guilty.
4. Dependent (3)	16	excessive need to be taken care of, a lack of self - confidence, submissive and clinging behaviours, and a fear of separation.
5. Histrionic (4)	17	excessive and rapidly shifting emotions, attention - seeking and sexually seductive, including theatrically and an over - concern with attractiveness
6. Narcissistic (5)	24	a grandiose sense of self importance, and an unjust sense of entitlement, as well as arrogance, a lack of empathy, and a tendency to exploit others.
7. Antisocial (6a)	17	unwillingness to conform to social norms, including deficient guilt and remorse for one's irresponsible, manipulative, deceitful, impulsive, irritable and aggressive behaviours.
8. Aggressive (6b)	20	physically and / or verbally demeaning behaviours, often aggressively explosive and precipitous, which are expressed to intimidate, control and dominate others.
9. Compulsive (7)	17	behavioral rigidity, and a preoccupation with rules, perfectionism, control and orderliness at the expense of flexibility, warmth, openness and spontaneity.
10. Negativistic (8a)	16	obstructiveness, sullenness, and negativism, feeling of being victimized and misunderstood, envious and resentful of those more successful or powerful.
11. Self Defeating (8b)	15	engages in self - sacrifice, undermines pleasurable experiences and is drawn to relationships that lead to disappointment, failure or mistreatment.

Scales	Item no.	Content
<i>Severe Personality Pathology</i>		
1. Schizotypal (S)	16	social peculiarities and interpersonal deficits, as well as eccentric behaviours and thoughts, a reduced capacity for close relationships, and frequent cognitive distortions.
2. Borderline (C)	16	marked instability in interpersonal relationships, self image, affects and impulses, fears of abandonment, suicidal threats, and self - destructive behaviours.
3. Paranoid (P)	17	recurrent suspicions and distrust of others, such that the motives of family and work association are persistently questioned and their intentions interpreted as devious and malevolent.
<i>Clinical Syndromes</i>		
1. Anxiety (A)	14	either vaguely apprehensive or specifically phobic, were typically tense, indecisive and restless, and tend to complain of physical discomfort.
2. Somatoform (H)	12	psychological difficulties are expressed through somatic channels, with persistent periods of fatigue and weakness, and a preoccupation with ill health and a variety of dramatic but largely nonspecific pains.
3. Bipolar: Manic (N)	13	experiences periods of superficial elation, inflated self - esteem, restless overactivity, distractibility, pressured speech, impulsiveness and irritability.
4. Dysthymia (D)	14	though remains involved in everyday life, high scorer has been preoccupied over a period of years with feelings of discouragement or guilt, a lack of self - initiative, behavioral apathy, and low self - esteem.
5. Alcohol Dependence (B)	15	probably has a history of alcoholism but is unsuccessful in overcoming the problems, and, as a consequence, experiences considerable discomfort in both family and work settings.
6. Drug Dependence (T)	14	likely to have a recurrent or recent history of drug abuse, tends to have difficulty restraining impulses or keeping them within conventional social limits, and is unable to manage the consequences of this behaviours.
7. PTSD (R)*	16	feeling fearful and helpless due to a life - threatening events; other symptoms include flashback, autonomic arousal and avoidant behaviours.

* PTSD stood for Posttraumatic Stress Disorder

Scales	Item no.	Content
<i>Severe Syndromes</i>		
1. Thought Disorder (SS)	17	high scorer are likely to be classified as schizophrenic, schizophreniform or experiencing brief reactive psychosis.
2. Major Depression (CC)	17	higher scorer are unlikely capable of functioning in a normal environment, are severely depressed, and express a dread of the future, suicidal ideation, and a sense of hopeless resignation.
3. Delusional Disorder(PP)	13	acutely paranoid and may become periodically belligerent , voicing irrational but interconnected delusions of a jealous, persecutory, or grandiose nature.

CUHK Libraries



003592715